

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE EFFECTS OF THE FEDERAL TAX	)	
REFORM ACT OF 1986 ON THE RATES OF	)	CASE NO. 9779
KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY	)	

O R D E R

On December 11, 1986, the Commission established this case for the purpose of determining the effects of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 ("Tax Reform Act") on the rates of Kentucky Power Company ("Kentucky Power"). The Order initially establishing these proceedings was directed to all utilities with revenues in excess of \$1 million. The Commission limited its investigations to the major utilities since the impact on smaller privately owned utilities was relatively insignificant. After a review of the initial filings, the Commission disposed of a number of cases due to the minimal impact on rates and the extent of the Commission's regulation of certain competitive telecommunications utilities. At this time, 15 utilities remain under the purview of this examination.

On January 26, 1987, Kentucky Power filed testimony and other exhibits in response to the Commission's Order which reflected a decrease in annual revenues of \$6,780,014<sup>1</sup> at the 34 percent

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by Supplemental Testimony, filed March 11, 1987.

federal tax rate. As a result of the findings and determinations herein, the revenues of Kentucky Power will be decreased by \$6,940,191 annually. The overall reduction in revenue requirements for the 15 utilities subject to these proceedings is in excess of \$75 million.

Motions to intervene were filed by the Utility and Rate Intervention Division of the Office of the Attorney General ("AG"); Utility Rate Cutters of Kentucky, Inc., ("URC"); and Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers ("KIUC"). All motions to intervene were granted by the Commission. Thomas C. DeWard, on behalf of the AG, and David H. Kinloch, on behalf of URC, submitted prefiled testimony in this case. KIUC did not submit testimony, but filed comments through its counsel.

A public hearing was held at the Commission's offices in Frankfort, Kentucky, on May 8, 1987.

#### COMMENTARY

In its Order of December 11, 1986, the Commission expressed the opinion that the focus of this proceeding should be reflecting the effects of the Tax Reform Act in rates. Thus, the Commission considered the three primary issues in this matter to be: (1) determining the amount of the revenue change required due to the Tax Reform Act; (2) determining the appropriate date of any rate change; and (3) distributing the revenue change among rate schedules.

The Commission required that a 12-month period ending no more than 90 days from December 11, 1986, the date of the Order establishing this case, should be used to determine the effects of the Tax Reform Act. Kentucky Power proposed and the Commission has accepted the 12-month period ending November 30, 1986, as the test period for determining the reasonableness of the proposed rates.

#### PROCEDURAL ISSUES

##### Single-Issue Approach

Throughout these proceedings, there have been objections to the methodology used by the Commission in determining the reasonableness of each utility's rates subsequent to the Tax Reform Act. Certain utilities have characterized the Commission's actions as "single-issue" rate-making. Implicit in their objections is the notion that single-issue rate-making is contrary to law.<sup>2</sup>

This notion was rebutted by, among others, Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU"). In his opening argument, in Case No. 9780,<sup>3</sup> counsel for KU stated that this proceeding is soundly based. KU recognized that there was good reason to focus the proceeding on the tax changes.<sup>4</sup> In its post-hearing brief, KU further stated its agreement with the Commission's position that retaining the

---

<sup>2</sup> Other states have upheld single-issue rate-making proceedings, see for example, Consumers Power Company v. Michigan Public Service Commission, Mich. App., 237 NW 2d 189 (1975).

<sup>3</sup> Case No. 9780, The Effects of the Federal Tax Reform Act of 1986 on the Rates of Kentucky Utilities Company.

<sup>4</sup> Hearing Transcript, May 4, 1987, page 9.

savings resulting from tax reform was not a proper way for KU to improve its earnings and indicated that a focused proceeding, expeditiously passing the tax savings to ratepayers, was reasonable as long as KU was permitted to maintain its test-period rate of return.<sup>5</sup>

Those complaining of single-issue rate adjustments overlook the Commission's long established practice of adjusting rates for fuel cost charges through Fuel Adjustment Clause ("FAC") and Purchased Gas Adjustment Clause ("PGA") proceedings. Each of these involves setting rates solely on the changes of the cost of coal or natural gas.

Apart from the propriety of single-issue rate-making, however, it must be pointed out that from the outset these cases have never been limited to a single issue. The order of December 11, 1986, did indicate that the Tax Reform Act was the focus of these investigations. However, it stated at page 2:

If, aside from the Tax Reform Act, a utility feels that its rates are insufficient, it has the discretion by statute to file a full rate case with the Commission. By initiating this case the Commission is in no way prohibiting or restricting any utility from filing a rate case encompassing all rate-making issues in a separate proceeding.

This Order was clarified on January 21, 1987, in Case No. 9799, The Effects of the Federal Tax Reform Act of 1986 on the Rates of Continental Telephone Company ("Continental"). That Order states:

---

<sup>5</sup> Brief for KU, filed May 22, 1987, page 4.

Because of the breadth of this investigation and the number of parties involved, it is necessary to categorize some information into a consistent, well-defined scope. That scope is explained in the December 11, 1986, Order. The information as it relates to the specific changes occasioned by the Tax Reform Act should be filed as the December 11, 1986, Order requires. The expected effects of those changes on rates should be filed as well. Simply because the Commission deems certain information necessary, and deems it necessary to be filed in a particular format does not preclude the filing of other information a party believes is pertinent.

For these reasons, the Commission ORDERS that:

- (1) All parties shall comply with the December 11, 1986, Order;
- (2) Any party may file any additional information it deems relevant;
- (3) Any party may file alternative proposals for the resolution of this investigation.

Thus, there is not, nor has there been, any limitation on any party filing additional information up to and including an adjustment of all rates. The Commission focused its attention primarily on the Tax Reform Act because of the potentially extraordinary impact of this act on the finances and rates of utilities.

Federal income taxes are in one sense an assessment by the federal government on the utilities for their proportionate share of the federal government's budget. Under accepted regulatory rate-making practices, these federal income taxes are included as part of a utility's expenses that are used to establish rates. Thus, through the rate-making process, the utility can be thought of as a collection agent for federal taxes and a conduit through which federal taxes are transferred from ratepayers to the federal government. Because the Tax Reform Act represents such a historic change in federal tax policy, the Commission determined that it was in the best interests of all concerned--utilities and rate-

payers alike--to reflect these tax changes in each company's rates as expeditiously as possible. For that reason, the initial concern was the reduction of the corporate tax rate from 46 percent to 34 percent and other relatively minor adjustments caused by the changes in the Federal Tax Code. As we explained in our December 11, 1986, Order:

First, it would be extremely cumbersome and expensive for the Commission to simultaneously initiate rate cases covering all utilities affected by this Order. Many utilities may not wish to incur the time-consuming and expensive task of preparing a complete rate case at this time. A proceeding that recognizes only the effects of the Tax Reform Act would minimize the time and expense of both the Commission and the utilities.

Secondly, the Commission does not view retaining the savings that result from tax reform as a proper way for a utility to improve its earnings. Likewise, if the Tax Reform Act should result in major cost increases, these costs should be recognized in rates expeditiously....

Finally, by initiating limited cases for every major utility, the expertise of all interested parties can be pooled to assure that all aspects of the Tax Reform Act are fairly reflected in utility rates.

In an effort to fairly reflect only the effects of the Tax Reform Act in the companies' rates, the Commission, to the extent possible, and with the acquiescence of the companies, narrowed the scope of the analysis. All quantifiable aspects of the revenue requirement effects of the Tax Reform Act have been considered, and therefore the rate adjustments ordered herein should have no effect on the utility's earnings.

In summary, the Tax Reform Act is a unique and historic change in tax law that substantially affects the cost of providing utility service. The primary considerations in narrowing the

scope of these proceedings were that: (1) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act was clearly beyond the control of the utility; (2) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act affected all major privately owned utilities in a similar manner; (3) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act had a major impact on the cost of service of utilities; and, (4) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act was effective at a specified date which was scheduled to occur quickly, requiring expeditious action on the part of the Commission.

For all of the reasons previously stated, the procedure used by the Commission is one that is efficient, reflective of sound regulatory methods, responsive to the substantive and procedural rights of all parties, and consistent with the jurisdiction of the Commission.

#### Burden of Proof

Several utilities have suggested that the Commission bears the burden of proving the reasonableness of the rates that have been adjusted to reflect the effects of the Tax Reform Act. Continental, for example, cites KRS 278.430. However, this statute refers to appeals of Commission orders to circuit court. It obviously is not applicable to a proceeding before the Commission itself.

In its Order of December 11, 1986, the Commission on its own motion took the extraordinary step of establishing these investigations in response to the historic Tax Reform Act of 1986. There is no statute assigning a burden of proof in this type of special case. KRS 278.250 is particularly noteworthy. After giving the

parties a hearing and carefully reviewing the record, the Commission has determined the fair, just, and reasonable rates for each respective utility as prescribed by KRS 278.030. We believe that this procedure is consistent with our statutory responsibilities.

#### Retroactive Rates

Another issue that has been raised in these proceedings is the possibility of a retroactive change in rates. We have decided that the reduction in each utility's tax rate and the related adjustments will not be reflected in the utility's rates until July 2, 1987. Those rates will be charged for service rendered on and after July 2, 1987. Thus, the rates are entirely prospective, and the issue of retroactivity is moot.

#### Testimony of URC

The URC filed testimony in each of these cases. However, its witness did not appear at the hearing and was not subject to cross-examination. Several of the parties moved to strike URC's prefiled testimony. After considering the nature of the testimony filed by URC, the Commission will treat it as comment rather than evidence and weigh it accordingly.

### DETERMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE TAX REFORM ACT

#### Excess Deferred Taxes

A reduction in the corporate tax rates results in an excess or surplus deferred tax reserve, since deferred taxes resulting from depreciation-related and non-depreciation-related tax timing differences were provided by ratepayers at a higher tax rate than the rate at which they will be flowed back.



On January 1, 1979, the federal corporate income tax rate decreased from 48 to 46 percent. Utilities, in general, flowed back deferred taxes at the new statutory tax rate, which resulted in an excess provision for deferred taxes. The Commission recognized the existence of these excess deferred taxes and in subsequent rate proceedings required that the excess be returned to the ratepayer over a 5-year amortization period.

The change in tax rates under the Tax Reform Act from 46 percent to 34 percent creates a substantial excess provision for deferred taxes. The Tax Reform Act requires that deferred taxes related to depreciation timing differences be flowed back no faster than under the "average-rate assumption method." Under this method an average rate is calculated and, as timing differences reverse, the accumulated deferred taxes are credited to income at the average rate, reducing the excess deferred taxes to zero over the remaining life of the property. Moreover, the Tax Reform Act provides that if a regulatory commission requires a more rapid reduction of the excess provision for deferred taxes, book depreciation must be used for tax purposes. The Tax Reform Act does not, however, have specific provisions for the excess deferred taxes that are not related to depreciation. Therefore, the excess deferred taxes have been generally characterized as "protected" (depreciation-related) and "unprotected" (not related to depreciation).

The treatment requested for the unprotected excess deferred taxes by the parties in these cases varies. The AG's witness has not recommended the flow back over an accelerated time period in

these cases. Mr. DeWard stated that it would be more appropriate to consider this issue in a general rate proceeding. This would allow companies to retain those benefits to offset some of the negative impacts of the Tax Reform Act, such as reduced cash flow. The Commission recognizes the existence of the excess deferred taxes and is of the opinion that these taxes provided by rate-payers in previous years should be returned in an equitable manner. However, the various options for returning these benefits could not be fully explored within the context of this expedited proceeding. Therefore, the issue regarding accelerated amortization of excess deferred taxes will be considered in future general rate proceedings and not in the present, limited proceeding.

The primary position taken by most utilities on this issue was that deferred income taxes should be amortized, as timing differences reverse, using the tax rates in effect at the time they originated or using the average rate assumption method. Therefore, adjustments have been made to insure that deferred taxes resulting from timing differences that are reversing are included at the rate provided, as required under the Tax Reform Act.

#### Rate Base Adjustments

In addition to adjusting tax expense to reflect the reduction in the tax rate, most utilities involved in these proceedings have proposed that the effects on cash flow be recognized in determining the effect on revenue requirements. Two views have been advanced as to how cash flow requirements are increased by the Tax

Reform Act. The first is that rate base is increased due to the Tax Reform Act's reduction in temporary timing differences between the book and tax return income tax expense. This reduction in timing differences reduces deferred taxes. Since deferred taxes serve as a deduction from rate base, the effect is to increase rate base. The second view is that the Tax Reform Act results in a greater current tax liability and, consequently, additional cash flow requirements. This additional cash flow must be provided for in additional capital requirements that increase the overall cost of service.

In its determination, the Commission has not distinguished between these two viewpoints, and has generally allowed adjustments to reflect the level of additional cash flow requirements it considers appropriate without regard to whether the result flows from a reduction in deferred taxes or an increase in capital requirements. The effect on revenue requirements is essentially the same.

The objective of the Commission in giving recognition to those aspects of the Tax Reform Act that affect capital requirements is to leave the company in the same earnings position as before the rate change in this case. A number of utilities, in determining the revenue requirements impact of the rate base adjustments, applied the rate of return granted in their last general rate case. The Commission finds this approach to be inappropriate. To apply the allowed return, where it is greater than the test-year actual return, to the incremental increase in rate base would result in improving the earnings position for the

utility with respect to return on rate base achieved prior to the implementation of the Tax Reform Act rate adjustment. The Commission, therefore, considers it more appropriate to use the test-year actual rate of return rather than the rate of return granted in the last rate case. This will maintain the company's rate of return at the test year level and will neither improve nor reduce the company's earnings position.

A number of adjustments were proposed by the various utilities as adjustments to rate base and cash flow. In evaluating the appropriateness of these adjustments, the Commission has concluded that adjustments which reflect changes resulting from the application of the Tax Reform Act to test year operations are acceptable. However, those adjustments that reflect the application of the Tax Reform Act to future operations are not. In other words, the Commission will not allow adjustments for those aspects of the Tax Reform Act which are dependent upon the addition of plant to the system. Such adjustments are beyond the end of the test year and relate to serving additional customers or growth in the system. In the absence of corresponding revenue and capitalization adjustments, the recognition of such post-test year adjustments would create a mismatch between revenue, capitalization, and rate base. The derivation of such revenue and capitalization adjustments are speculative in nature and not generally allowed by this Commission in rate cases. The Commission has, therefore, excluded from the determination of revenue requirements herein all adjustments which are affected by the Tax Reform Act on a post-test year basis.

Based upon the various adjustments proposed in one or more of these cases, following is a synopsis of the Commission's findings and determinations:

Rate Base Adjustments Allowed

The decrease in deferred taxes resulting from changes in the tax code relating to unbilled revenue, uncollectible accounts, certain business expenses, superfund taxes, and test-period investment tax credits ("ITC") has been included since it meets the criterion of being based upon the application of the Tax Reform Act to actual test year operations, is unrelated to plant growth, and does not create a mismatch between test-year rate base and pro forma revenues and capitalization.

Rate Base Adjustments Disallowed

1. Depreciation Several utilities proposed to recognize the effect of the Tax Reform Act's new Modified Accelerated Cost Recovery System ("MACRS") on rate base. Generally, MACRS will result in lower depreciation expense per tax return, which results in a greater current tax liability in the future. MACRS did not become effective, however, until January 1, 1987, and is applicable only to property placed in service after that date. This is a post-test year occurrence for all utilities participating in these proceedings. As previously noted, the Commission finds it inappropriate to recognize such post-test period adjustments.

2. ITC Based Upon Future Plant Additions The Commission has disallowed proposed adjustments to recognize the loss of ITC on plant placed in service subsequent to the test year since the

inclusion of plant and capital associated with said ITCs is not generally allowed by the Commission for rate-making purposes.

3. Capitalized Overheads The Tax Reform Act's capitalization requirements for interest, pension and benefit costs, and so forth, are not effective until January 1, 1987, and thus will only pertain to construction after this date. Because of the post-test year nature of this adjustment, the Commission has not included these adjustments in this proceeding.

4. Contributions in Aid of Construction The Tax Reform Act provision requiring contributions to be included as taxable income on the tax return of the utility is not effective until January 1, 1987, and thus will relate only to post-test period construction. The Commission has, therefore, disallowed adjustments proposing to reflect loss of cash flow resulting from the taxability of contributions.

#### Implementation Date

The Tax Reform Act, which reduces the top corporate tax rate to 34 percent, produces an effective tax rate for 1987 of 40 percent. This is the blended or average rate based on the current tax rate of 46 percent, which is in effect for the first 6 months of 1987, and the 34 percent rate which becomes effective July 1, 1987. The current rates of most utilities are based on the 46 percent tax rate which was in effect at the time the rates were set by the Commission. Therefore, since January 1, 1987, most utilities have charged rates based on a tax rate of 46 percent which is in excess of the 1987 blended rate of 40 percent.

Generally, in order to reflect the effects of the Tax Reform Act during 1987 and beyond, the Commission has two basic options: adjust rates retroactive to January 1, 1987, based on the 1987 blended tax rate of 40 percent and adjust rates January 1, 1988, based on the 34 percent tax rate, or make one adjustment effective July 1, 1987, based on a 34 percent tax rate, to achieve the same overall effect. By this second approach, most companies will have charged rates for the first half of 1987 based on a 46 percent tax rate and for the second half of 1987 based on a 34 percent tax rate. This will result in rates (and tax collections) for 1987 that equate to a blended tax rate of 40 percent.

In response to concerns of some utilities concerning the July 1, 1987, rate change, the Commission cites Section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which prescribes the method of computing taxes in 1987 for calendar year taxpayers. That section requires that "tentative taxes" for 1987 be computed by applying both the 46 percent tax rate and the 34 percent tax rate to taxable income for the entire calendar year; and the tax for the calendar year shall then be the sum of each tentative tax in proportion to the number of days in each 6-month period as compared to the number of days in the entire taxable year.

The Commission is of the opinion that a one-time adjustment, based on a 34 percent tax rate, effective July 2, 1987, will meet the transitional requirements of calendar year 1987 and achieve the Commission's goals for this proceeding as set out in its Order of December 11, 1986.

### Revenue Requirements

Based on the tax rate reduction and the other Tax Reform Act-related adjustments accepted herein, Kentucky Power's annual tax expense for rate-making purposes will decline by \$4,545,408, which in turn will increase operating income by the same \$4,545,408.

Taxable Income	\$40,820,903
MULTIPLY BY:	
Change in Tax Rates (49.92% - 38.785%)	X <u>.11135</u>
REDUCTION IN TAXES	<u>\$ 4,545,408</u>

In the above calculation the impact of the reversing tax timing differences is reflected in the tax reduction to conform with the requirements of the Tax Reform Act that the reversing timing differences be credited to income at the rate determined under the average rate assumption method. This is consistent with the position of Kentucky Power and of the AG.

To reflect the tax reduction in rates, it is necessary to apply a revenue conversion factor to determine the reduction in revenue requirements caused by the reduction in tax expense.

Kentucky Power proposed using a revenue conversion factor of 1.6372 based on the 34 percent federal tax rate. The Commission finds this factor, which also reflects state income taxes and an allowance for uncollectible accounts, to be an accurate and reasonable means of calculating the change in Kentucky Power's revenue requirements. The reduction in revenue requirements is calculated as follows:



Reduction in Taxes	\$4,545,408
LESS:	
Commission 48/46% Reduction	<u>&lt;306,347&gt;</u>
Subtotal	\$4,239,061
MULTIPLY BY:	X <u>1.6372</u>
REVENUE REQUIREMENTS REDUCTION	<u>\$6,940,191</u>

In the above calculation, an adjustment has been allowed for the amortization of excess deferred federal income tax ordered by the Commission in Case No. 8429<sup>6</sup> to flow back excess deferred taxes related to the 1979 change in the federal tax rate from 48 percent to 46 percent, which is expiring.

Therefore, based on the tax rate reduction to 34 percent and the other Tax Reform Act-related changes which the Commission has accepted herein, Kentucky Power's annual revenue requirements decline by \$6,940,191. The reduction should flow the Tax Reform Act tax savings to Kentucky Power's ratepayers while having a neutral impact on its earnings. Such a result is consistent with the Commission's objectives as set out in its Order of December 11, 1986.

#### Contributions in Aid of Construction and Customer Advances

The Tax Reform Act requires that any contributions received in aid of construction, or any other contribution by a customer or potential customer, to provide or encourage the provision of services to or for the benefit of the transferor be included as

---

<sup>6</sup> Case No. 8429, General Adjustment in Electric Rates of Kentucky Power Company, Final Order dated June 18, 1982.

taxable income.<sup>7</sup> On December 12, 1986, Kentucky-American Water Company ("Kentucky-American") submitted a letter to the Commission wherein it proposed the following options for treatment of contributions and customer advances for construction:

- a. "No Refund" Option: Under this alternative the contributor would not be entitled to any potential refunds. The total amount contributed would be recorded as ordinary income for tax purposes and the associated tax would be recorded as a payable. Kentucky-American would supply the capital necessary for completion of the construction (construction cost - net contributions).
- b. "Refund" Option: Under this alternative the contributor would be entitled to the potential refund. The contribution would be increased to include federal income taxes and the total amount received would be recorded as ordinary income for tax purposes. The contributor would then be entitled to the potential refund of the entire contribution within the statutory time limit of 10 years.

Further, Kentucky-American proposed that for contributions in aid of construction the no refund option be used for rate-making purposes.

---

<sup>7</sup> Explanation of Tax Reform Act of 1986. Commerce Clearing House, Inc., par. 1,670, page 486.

After careful consideration of the information presented by Kentucky-American, the Commission is of the opinion that the refund option as proposed by Kentucky-American appears to be the most equitable method of passing on the taxes related to contributions to both the utility and its general body of ratepayers, in that it will require the customers receiving the service to pay for the total cost of providing that service with the potential for future refunding. Further, the utility and its general body of ratepayers would be only obligated to contribute capital in the future as customers are added to the system and the benefits from those additions are received. Therefore, the Commission has chosen the refund option for use by Kentucky-American and for general applicability to all utilities.

The Commission recognizes that this policy is being established based solely on the evidence presented by Kentucky-American and is of the opinion that this matter should be investigated further in a separate proceeding. Therefore, the policy is being implemented on a temporary basis subject to the outcome of a formal investigation wherein all parties will be given the opportunity to submit evidence on this issue.

The treatment of contributions established herein will result in no revenue requirement impact on the utilities in these proceedings and, thus, no adjustment has been recognized.

#### Rate Design

In the order establishing this case, the Commission suggested that the reduction in revenue resulting from the Tax Reform Act could be spread to consumers by a uniform reduction to all KWH

charges. Kentucky Power has filed rates designed to flow through the revenue requirement reduction resulting from the Tax Reform Act on a uniform KWH basis. This method is equitable and achieves the intent of the Commission to conform with the rate design approved in the last rate case.

Kentucky Power's reduction factor of \$.00144 per KWH was determined by dividing the revenue reduction of \$6,940,191 by KWH sales of 4,824,971,139.

#### Statutory Notice

The Commission has determined, as provided in KRS 278.180, that a notice period of less than 30 days is reasonable. The shorter notice period was required because the Tax Reform Act was passed by Congress in October 1986, with an effective date of January 1, 1987, which provided a relatively short time for the Commission to conduct investigatory proceedings and issue orders implementing rates effective July 2, 1987, to reflect the 40 percent tax rate in utility rates for 1987 under the procedure established herein.

#### SUMMARY

The Commission, after consideration of the evidence of record and being advised, is of the opinion and finds that:

1. The Tax Reform Act results in a substantial cost savings to Kentucky Power and said cost savings should be flowed through to ratepayers in an equitable manner.

2. The unique characteristics and primary considerations of this proceeding that require narrowing its scope are: (1) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act was clearly beyond the

control of the utility; (2) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act affected all major privately owned utilities in a similar manner; (3) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act had a major impact on the cost of service of utilities; and, (4) the cost change generated by the Tax Reform Act became effective at a specified date which required expeditious action on the part of the Commission.

3. The implementation procedure detailed herein is an equitable method for determining the adjustment in revenues required to reflect the 40 percent Federal Income Tax Rate in the rates of utilities for the calendar year 1987.

4. The existing rates of Kentucky Power are unreasonable inasmuch as they reflect a federal income tax provision that is no longer in effect.

5. The adjustment to rates prescribed herein has no affect on the earnings of Kentucky Power after recognition of the cost savings resulting from the Tax Reform Act, and consequently said rate adjustment is fair, just, and reasonable.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The motion to strike the testimony of Mr. Kinloch is denied.

2. All other motions not specifically addressed are denied.

3. The rates in Appendix A are the approved rates for service rendered on and after July 2, 1987.

4. Revised tariffs reflecting the rates set out in Appendix A shall be filed within 30 days from the date of this Order.

5. Revised tariffs reflecting the Commission's policy on the treatment of taxes associated with contributions in aid of construction shall be filed within 30 days from the date of this Order.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 11th day of June, 1987.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Richard D. Hemminger  
Chairman

Paul H. J. L.  
Vice-Chairman

Spencer N. Williams  
Commissioner

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Director

APPENDIX A  
APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE  
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 9779 DATED June 11, 1987.

The following rates and charges are prescribed for the customers in the area served by Kentucky Power Company. All other rates and charges not specifically mentioned herein shall remain the same as those in effect under authority of this Commission prior to the effective date of this Order.

TARIFF R. S.  
(Residential Service)

RATE:

<u>Service Charge</u>	\$4.25 per month
<u>Energy Charge</u>	
First 500 KWH per month	5.161¢ per KWH
All Over 500 KWH per month	4.487¢ per KWH

TARIFF RS - LM - TOD  
(Residential Load Management Time-of-Day  
Electric Service Schedule)

RATE:

For the service provided under this Tariff, the rate shall be:

<u>Service Charge:</u>	\$6.75 per month
<u>Energy Charge:</u>	
All KWH used during on-peak billing period	7.017¢ per KWH
All KWH used during off-peak billing period	2.603¢ per KWH

TARIFF G. S.  
(General Service)

RATE:

For Capacity Requirements Less Than 5 KW:

Service Charge: \$9.85 per month

Energy Charge:

First 500 KWH per month 6.401¢ per KWH

All over 500 KWH per month 3.925¢ per KWH

Monthly Minimum Charge: \$9.85

For Capacity Requirements of 5 KW and Above:

	<u>Delivery Voltage</u>	
	<u>Below 2.4 KV</u>	<u>2.4 KV and Above</u>
Service Charge per Month:	\$10.80	\$16.20
Demand Charge per KW:	\$1.00	\$1.00
Energy Charge:		
KWH equal to 200 times KW of monthly billing demand	5.312¢	4.809¢
KWH in excess of 200 times KW of monthly billing demand	4.432¢	4.207¢

LOAD MANAGEMENT TIME-OF-DAY PROVISION:

RATE:

Service Charge: \$3.00 per customer per month

Energy Charge: 7.524¢ per KWH for all KWH  
consumed on-peak

3.007¢ per KWH for all KWH  
consumed off-peak

SPECIAL TARIFF PROVISION FOR RECREATIONAL LIGHTING SERVICE:

RATE:

Service Charge: \$10.80 per month

Energy Charge: 5.241¢ per KWH



TARIFF L. G. S.  
(Large General Service)

RATE:

	<u>Delivery Voltage</u>		
	<u>Under 2.4 KV</u>	<u>2.4 KV- 12.5 KV</u>	<u>34.5 KV- 69 KV</u>
Service Charge per month	\$85.00	\$127.50	\$535.50
Demand Charge per KVA	\$2.75	\$2.75	\$2.75
Energy Charge per KWH	4.124¢	3.465¢	2.940¢

TARIFF Q.P.  
(Quantity Power)

RATE:

	<u>Delivery Voltage</u>		
	<u>2.4 KV- 12.5 KV</u>	<u>34.5 KV- 69 KV</u>	<u>Above 69 KV</u>
Service Charge per month	\$276.00	\$662.00	\$1,353.00
Demand Charge per KW	\$8.57	\$7.80	\$7.22
Energy Charge per KWH	1.865¢	1.824¢	1.803¢

Reactive Demand Charge:

For each kilovar of lagging reactive  
demand in excess of 50% of the KW of  
monthly billing demand

\$ .49 per KVAR

TARIFF O. L.  
(Outdoor Lighting)

MONTHLY RATE:

A. OVERHEAD LIGHTING SERVICE

1. High Pressure Sodium	
100 watts (9,500 Lumens)	\$5.04 per lamp
200 watts (22,000 Lumens)	\$7.62 per lamp

2. Mercury Vapor*	
175 watts (7,000 Lumens)	\$4.87 per lamp
250 watts (11,000 Lumens)	\$6.46 per lamp
400 watts (20,000 Lumens)	\$8.13 per lamp
3. Incandescent*	
189 watts (2,500 Lumens)	\$4.91 per lamp

#### B. POST-TOP LIGHTING SERVICE

1. Mercury Vapor*	
175 watts (7,000 Lumens) on 12-foot post	\$5.65 per lamp
2. High Pressure Sodium	
100 watts (9,500 Lumens) on 12-foot post	\$8.69 per lamp

#### C. FLOODLIGHTING SERVICE

1. High Pressure Sodium	
200 watts (22,000 Lumens)	\$8.87 per lamp
400 watts (50,000 Lumens)	\$12.26 per lamp

#### TARIFF S. L. (Street Lighting)

#### MONTHLY RATE:

##### A. Overhead Service on Existing Distribution Poles

1. Mercury Vapor	
100 Watts (3,500 Lumens)	\$3.18 per lamp
175 Watts (7,000 Lumens)	\$4.01 per lamp
250 Watts (11,000 Lumens)	\$5.11 per lamp
400 Watts (20,000 Lumens)	\$6.10 per lamp
700 Watts (30,000 Lumens)	\$9.02 per lamp
1,000 Watts (50,000 Lumens)	\$10.95 per lamp
4,000 Watts (4-50,000 Lumen Lights on One Pole	\$29.74 per lamp
2. High Pressure Sodium	
70 Watts (5,800 Lumens)	\$3.85 per lamp
100 Watts (9,500 Lumens)	\$4.31 per lamp
150 Watts (16,000 Lumens)	\$4.85 per lamp
200 Watts (22,000 Lumens)	\$5.64 per lamp
400 Watts (50,000 Lumens)	\$7.87 per lamp

B. Overhead Service on Existing Special Metal or Concrete Poles - "Whiteway"

1. Mercury Vapor	
400 Watts (20,000 Lumens)	\$8.35 per lamp
700 Watts (30,000 Lumens)	\$11.72 per lamp
1,000 Watts (50,000 Lumens)	\$13.65 per lamp

C. Underground Service on Existing Special Metal Pole - Post Top

1. Mercury Vapor	
175 Watts (7,000 Lumens)	\$4.01 per lamp

D. Service on New Wood Distribution Poles

1. High Pressure Sodium	
70 Watts (5,800 Lumens)	\$6.35 per lamp
100 Watts (9,500 Lumens)	\$6.81 per lamp
150 Watts (16,000 Lumens)	\$7.35 per lamp
200 Watts (22,000 Lumens)	\$8.69 per lamp
400 Watts (50,000 Lumens)	\$10.92 per lamp

E. Service on New Metal or Concrete Poles

1. High Pressure Sodium	
70 Watts (5,800 Lumens)	\$13.20 per lamp
100 Watts (9,500 Lumens)	\$13.66 per lamp
150 Watts (16,000 Lumens)	\$14.20 per lamp
200 Watts (22,000 Lumens)	\$18.09 per lamp
400 Watts (50,000 Lumens)	\$18.92 per lamp

TARIFF M. W.  
(Municipal Waterworks)

RATE:

Service Charge: \$22.90 per month

Energy Charge:  
All KWH used per month 4.261¢ per KWH

TARIFF C.I.P. - T.O.D.  
(Commercial and Industrial Power - Time-of-Day)

RATE:

	<u>Delivery Voltage</u>		
	<u>2.4 KV- 12.5 KV</u>	<u>34.5 KV- 69 KV</u>	<u>Above 69 KV</u>
Service Charge per month	\$276.00	\$662.00	\$1,353.00
Demand Charge per KW:			
On-Peak	\$7.50	\$6.83	\$6.40
Off-Peak	\$1.77	\$1.07	\$0.96
Energy Charge per KWH	1.865¢	1.824¢	1.803¢
Reactive Demand Charge:			
For each KVAR of reactive demand in excess of 50% of the monthly on-peak or off-peak billing demands			\$ .49 per KVAR

TARIFF I. R. P.  
(Interruptible Power)

RATE:

	<u>Delivery Voltage</u>	
	<u>34.5 KV- 69 KV</u>	<u>Above 69 KV</u>
Service Charge per month	\$662.00	\$1,353.00
Demand Charge per KW:	\$6.63	\$6.14
Energy Charge per KWH	1.824¢	1.803¢
Reactive Demand Charge:		
For each KVAR of reactive demand in excess of 50% of the monthly billing demands		\$ .49 per KVAR